



September 9, 2004

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Public Information and Records Integrity Branch (7502C)
Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20460

RECEIVED

SEP 15 2004

OPP PUBLIC DOCKET
postmark 9/9/04

RE: Docket ID Number OPP-2004-0205

Dear U.S. EPA:

Unicorn Laboratories, EPA Company Number 28293, has the following comments regarding the application of the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals to pesticide labels:

1. As the GHS is not required by treaty, consideration should be given to not participating. Costs in human and economic resources for EPA, state regulatory agencies and pesticide registrants would be significant. No cost estimates for implementation are given within the planning issues document.
2. The GHS should not be at the expense of the current domestic regulatory scheme. For those products to be marketed internationally, a GHS label in addition to a domestic U.S. label could be an option. This would allow domestic pesticides to continue under existing rules. New, separate regulations authorizing a GHS label for international trade could be established. Many smaller U.S. pesticide registrants do not market internationally and would bear an undue burden simply for consistent worldwide labeling statements.
3. The current U.S. labeling rules are well established and recognized domestically. Changes as proposed under the GHS would create confusion among pesticide users. EPA has already spent considerable effort in the recent past on education efforts for our current system.
4. The two signal word system of GHS will be confusing to pesticide users accustomed to the current three word system. They would automatically assume higher toxicity of products that would show "Warning" under GHS, but "Caution" under the current system.
5. Maintaining proprietary information on inert ingredients should be a priority. Full disclosure would be revealing too much information in a competitive industry where formulations are a company's livelihood.
6. Phone numbers on labels should continue to be encouraged but not required. Smaller companies do not have the staff to field large volumes of phone calls.
7. If instituted, the GHS labeling changes should first be accomplished through a voluntary pilot program. It could be evaluated over a period of three years when any flaws should become apparent and corrections made before full scale implementation.

8. If the GHS is adopted as proposed, a separate process should be setup from current registration and re-registration activities. Significant time should be allowed for implementation of the labeling changes. At least three years should be given for registrations to be amended with provisions for use of existing label stocks for at least two years after label acceptance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lee Tharrington', with a stylized, flowing script.

Lee Tharrington
Regulatory Affairs